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Chapter 2

‘Religious Romanisation’ and the Fate of Italic Rural Sanctuaries

Italic and Roman Religion

When we come to speak about the religious aspects of the romanisation of Italy, it becomes clear that opinions on this matter have not developed analogously to the ideas on the ‘general’ romanisation of Italy in every respect. There are, of course, important parallels, but the subject has not been discussed as explicitly and vehemently as ‘general’ romanisation. Perhaps this is partly due to the fact that with ‘romanisation’ often implicitly themes of material culture are intended, which are the realm of archaeologists, whereas Italic and Roman religion have traditionally been the field of Religionswissenschaftler, ancient historians and especially linguists, who have been less preoccupied with the predominantly Anglo-Saxon archaeologically oriented discussion on romanisation. In any case, if the discrepancy in the development of the research agendas between studies on Italy and the provinces is already evident for the general romanisation discussion, it is unmistakable in the religious realm.1

One might discern three tendencies in modern scholarship which have influenced ideas on the religious aspects of the romanisation of Italy. First, Italic religion has usually been studied separately from discussions on the Roman conquest and romanisation. It is seen a distinctive aspect of Italic culture, and is treated in chapters or books in which the coming of Rome figures mainly as an endpoint.2 Indeed, with the general waning of pre-Roman cultures (cf. Strabo 6.1.2), the related religions would have faded as well. This notion fits well into the traditional conception of crisis and subsequent cultural assimilation to Rome in the fourth to third centuries BC (Chapter 1).

---

1 In contrast to studies on the situation in Italy, the bibliography of explicit studies on the religious aspects of the romanisation of the provinces is huge. Cf. e.g. Henig 1984; Metzler, Millet, Royman and Slofstra 1995; Webster 1995; Derks 1998; Frankfurter 1998; Scheid 1999; Van Andringa 2002; Häussler 2005; Häussler and King 2007.

Second, in many studies on Italic religion the basic similarities to Roman religion are pointed out. Departing from the concept of a basic ‘Italic religion’, Roman religion would be analogous to or part of it. Since direct literary evidence for Italic religion is virtually absent and it is primarily known from the material record, the literary evidence for Rome has been combined with the Italic evidence to construct a meaningful framework. Especially in studies on religion influenced by Indo-European theory a tendency to fit all evidence into one model is clear, to the effect that no meaningful difference can be made between Roman and other Italic religions even before the ‘coming of Rome’ in Italy. It is important, however, to acknowledge regional diversity within Italic religions, which may be largely hidden by a lack of evidence and indeed this tendency in scholarship to merge evidence from different contexts into one model. Perhaps it is right to underscore, with Olivier de Cazanove, that the religions of different Italic peoples are “in fact homologous religious cultures, but they do not coincide exactly”5, and to account for incompatibilities as well. Even if the evidence is scarce, it seems that at least some different conceptions existed. For example, the votive formula brateis datas (“for given favour”), widely spread in the interior, Oscan speaking areas, seems to betray a very different conception of the relation between men and god than in the Latin formula donom dat lubens merito (“gives his offering willing and deservedly”): whereas the Oscan formula emphasises the favour granted by the god, the Latin formula stresses the fulfillment of the vow by the dedicator. Moreover, even if the religious systems may have been similar, this does of course not imply that Roman and other Italic religions were interchangeable, or indeed ‘open’ to everyone (cf. infra). Third, concerning a later period in time, a similar ‘merging’ of the evidence becomes apparent. General studies on Roman Italy, i.e. Italy after its incorporation into the Roman state, have almost without exception assumed that religious practices in ‘Roman Italy’ were basically identical to those known from the city of Rome. In this way, the cults, festivals and calendar from Rome have been extrapolated to the whole of Italy.7 These assumptions on religion in Roman Italy prove to be problematic, but more disturbing in this discussion is that the developments between the floruit of ‘Italic religions’ and the presence of an apparently entirely ‘Roman’ religion few centuries later disappears in the gap between disciplines. It is fair to ask what has happened in the meantime. My concern here is not so much about changing religious ideas and belief systems, which is a subject of its own, but rather about ideas on the relation between Roman political dominance and Roman and Italic religious practices and cult places.

---

3 For an overview of ideas on continuities from prehistorical (Mycenaean) times on, cf. CANCIK 2008, esp. 8-13. Cf. also RÜPKE 2007, 2.
4 Cf. esp. the works by Dumézil.
6 RIX 2000.
7 E.g. LOMAS 1996, esp. 166: “Rome itself is the best-documented city in Italy in terms of religious ritual, but the pattern of religious behaviour seems to be broadly similar elsewhere in Italy.”
8 See e.g. COOLEY 2006 for nuanced cases of Roman religious aspects outside Rome; for calendars, see RÜPKE 1995.
*Ch. 2. ‘Religious Romanisation’*

**Rome in Italy**

**NON-INTERVENTION AS A POLICY AND ITS EXCEPTIONS**

What was the Roman attitude to Italic religious life? With some exceptions, the general idea seems to be that Rome fostered a minimum-intervention policy with regard to religious affairs in Italy outside its territory. Rome would have been generally uninterested in what happened outside Roman territory on a religious level, and this would have changed only after the municipalisation. This idea follows from the conception of Roman religion as basically a state religion, which only had relevance for its subjects. Conversion or proselytism obviously has no role to play in such a model. The civic model of Roman religion means that Rome could only actively influence religious matters in the areas whose inhabitants had citizenship, i.e. municipia and colonies. This would mean that we can only speak meaningfully of the ‘religious romanisation’ of the socii after the Social War, if we define romanisation here in an active sense as incorporation into the Roman state. And even then this process should not be seen as the rude imposition of totally new cults, but rather as a reorganisation of existing cults according to Roman standards. In the incorporated communities, pre-existing cults could be perpetuated as part of the municipalia sacra, which are defined by Festus as those cults “which the peoples concerned had always observed, before receiving Roman citizenship, and which the pontiffs wanted them to continue to observe and perform in the traditional forms of old”. John Scheid has emphasised the fundamental importance of the local authorities and traditions in the formation of a new religious system in colonies and municipia in the Roman western provinces, and it could be argued that the situation was not very different in Italy. To put it briefly, from the moment that a given area became part of the Roman state, local representatives of Roman authority probably had something to say about the official cults that were celebrated and how they were to be organised, and it is in this controlling mechanism that ‘religious romanisation’ could perhaps be recognised. The civic model does not, of course, preclude the possibility that Italic people adopted of their own free will aspects or elements that appear to belong to what we define Roman, in other words, self-romanisation on a religious level. As will be seen, such a process has indeed been conceptualised by some scholars. But on the whole there is a

9 SCHEID 1985a; SCHEID 1985b, 47-76. Cf. on prodigies ROSENBERGER 2005.
11 For a strong statement of this view: DE CAZANOVE 2000c. On Latin colonies, with the Latin right, cf. infra.
12 Fest. 146 L.: municipalia sacra vocantur, quae ab initio habuerunt ante civitatem Romanam acceptam, quae observare eos voluerunt pontifices, et eo more facere, quo adsuissent antiquitus.
13 Even if the difference between Italian and provincial municipalities should be acknowledged. SCHEID 1997, esp. 55-56; cf. also SCHEID 1999; DE CAZANOVE 2000c, 73; FRATEANTONIO 2003, 70-73; DE CAZANOVE 2007, 55 suggests that the cults listed in Verg. Aen. 7 may be examples of these sacra, but some of these are actually colonised cults, for which cf. infra.
14 In the words of Rüpke: “If the Romans did not export their religion, they certainly exported their concept of religion.” RÜPKE 2007, 5.
consensus on the general laisser-faire attitude by Rome with regard to religious matters outside its territory before the Social War.

To this general rule of non-intervention before the Social War, two important exceptions are often highlighted. In the first place, the attempted suppression of the Bacchanalia in 186 BC by a senatusconsultum, and in the second place the colonies and their cults and rituals. Another, related topic which could be added is the (supposed) treatment of Italic sanctuaries by Rome, which will be commented upon later.

**THE SENATUSCONSULTUM DE BACCHANALIBUS**

In the case of the senatusconsultum de Bacchanalibus literary and epigraphical sources meet one another in the description given in Livy’s book 39 (8-19) and an inscription with, apparently, a copy of the edict found in 1640 near the Calabrian locality of Tiriolo.\(^{15}\) It appears that the Senate wished to curtail the Bacchanalia, and Livy vividly explains the circumstances around the discovery of the coniuriatio. It does not seem necessary to discuss the nature of the evidence and the debate on the Bacchanalia itself, which has an immense bibliography,\(^{16}\) but I would like to highlight here only relevant points for the discussion on Roman interference within allied territory.

Livy writes on several occasions that the Bacchanalia were suppressed not only in Rome, but *per totam Italiam*.\(^{17}\) Thus, at first appearance it seems that Rome did, in fact, intervene in the religious affairs of the allies as well. But the concept of *Italia* has changed over time, and it is not to be excluded that it referred in the first place to Roman territory within the Italian peninsula, or at least was used variably, a situation which may have been misunderstood by imperial authors (such as Livy) writing in a, by then, unified Italy.\(^{18}\) The aforementioned inscription that seems to bear the senatusconsultum summarised by Livy was found in Tiriolo, ancient Bruttium. A small settlement of the third and second century BC has been excavated here.\(^{19}\) The

\(^{15}\) *CIL* I², 581. Cf. PAILLER 1986, 61-122.


\(^{17}\) Liv. 39.14.7; 17.4; 18.7. Livy writes (39.14.7) that the priests and priestesses of the Bacchanalia should be looked for “not only in Rome, but also in all the *fora* and *conciliabula*”, and continues that edicts should be dispatched *et in urbe et per totam Italiam*. It has been argued that *Italia* is used here as a stylistic variation on *fora et conciliabula*, and in this context would be synonymous with ‘Roman Italy’; i.e. those parts of Italy that held the citizenship, and therefore does not include allied territory (MOURITSEN 1998, 50-52). Liv. 39.17.4 does refer to the Italian allies, but does not mention Roman intervention, whereas 39.18.7-8 repeats the general *Roma / Italia* distinction; cf. DE CAZANOVE 2000b.

\(^{18}\) GALSTERER 1976, 37-41 (38 on the Bacchanalian affair) proposed that *Italia* as a legal term refers only to *ager Romanus* in the second century BC, cf. MOURITSEN 1998, 45 n. 25 who criticises, however, the notion of a common terminology in all sources, with further references. For a clear overview of the evidence (esp. Polyb. 6.13.4-6 and Livy 39) and the ideas on the meaning of Italia see MOURITSEN 1998, 45-58. Cf. Pailler’s reaction on Galsterer, PAILLER 1986, 330-332.

\(^{19}\) KAHRSTEDT 1959, 191; SPADEA 1977; SPADEA 1988, the site seems to have been abandoned at the beginning of the second century BC however (connected by DE CAZANOVE 2000b, 63 to the installation of the colony of Vibo).
document mentions the *ager Teuranus*, which probably coincides with modern Tiriolo. This area was presumably *ager publicus populi Romani*, confiscated from the Bruttians, at least from the second Punic war on. Both the locations mentioned by Livy in the context of the Bacchanalian affair, and the place of recovery of the inscription could thus possibly relate to Roman and Latin territories, not to *socii*, which has suggested that the suppression of the Bacchanalia was restricted to Roman territory. However, the opening lines of the inscription suggest something else. The edict regards explicitly ‘the Bacchanalia of the *foideratei*’ (lines 2-3: *de bacanalibus quei foideratei esent*). It seems that the Bacchanalia (which can indicate both the rituals and the cult places involved) of a *civitas foederata* are meant; not those on Roman territory. Mommsen has tried to resolve the discrepancy between the place and the target group by suggesting that *foideratei* indicates not a political status, but rather the sworn members of the cult. But since *foederatus* is not used in this sense elsewhere, this solution remains doubtful. Jean-Marie Pailler has proposed that *foideratei* generally refers to the inhabitants of the confiscated territory who did not have the Latin or Roman rights, and De Cazanove has recently suggested that the ‘Latin allies’ are intended, i.e. the inhabitants of a Latin colony, perhaps Vibo Valentia, installed in 192 BC.

Lines 7-8 of the inscription state that neither *cives Romani*, *nomen latinum* nor *socii* can participate in the Bacchanalia unless special authorisation is granted by the *praetor urbanus* and the Senate. Allies are thus banned from the cult. However, it is not said that this accounts for allied territory as well: it is possible that line 7 is only an explication of the reach of the edict within Roman territory, affecting people of all legal statuses. The archaeological evidence for the repression of the Bacchanalia is ambiguous too: there is dispute about the only *Bacchanal* outside Roman territory that would have

---


21 Recently, MOURITSEN 1998; DE CAZANOVE 2000c; DE CAZANOVE 2000b (arguing for Latin territory, however, cf. *infra*).

22 MOMMSEN 1877 1, 249, n. 3; MOMMSEN 1899, 875, followed by many others, amongst whom GALSTERER 1976, 169 and more recently MOURITSEN 1998.

23 PAILLER 1986, 290 dismisses this interpretation. In defense of Mommsen’s thesis, MOURITSEN 1998, 54 considers this counterargument “hardly cogent”, since “the source is very early and deals with an otherwise unique situation”.

24 PAILLER 1986, 290-291.

25 DE CAZANOVE 2000b, esp. 61-62, cf. DAHLHEIM 1968, 118 n. 19 for the consideration that relations between Latin colonies and Rome were regulated by a *foedus*; cf. MOURITSEN 1998, 53 n. 46. Perhaps the *ager Teuranus* was part of the colony of Vibo; cf. COSTABILE 1984, 96, who suggests that it represents one of the *fora et conciliabula* mentioned by Livy, but depended on the colony. De Cazanove’s thesis is dismissed by PFEILSCHIFTER 2006, 120 n. 26, in light of the distance between Vibo and Tiriolo, and the, ultimately, curious use of *foederati* for ‘Latin allies’.

26 MOURITSEN 1998, 55. This would thus constitute a useless repetition of what actually was self-evident.
been demolished as a consequence of the *senatusconsultum*, at Bolsena (Volsinii). De Cazanove has tried to eliminate this possible archaeological attestation of the repression by arguing that it was not a cult place but a cistern.\(^{27}\) However, the archaeological evidence seems to point indeed to a Bacchic cult place.\(^{28}\) Another example of a *Bacchanal* outside Roman territory apparently survived however. The Bacchic sanctuary of S. Abbondio near Pompeii, originating in the third century BC and still in use in 79 AD, would, according to the excavators, have survived the *senatusconsultum* because it was one of the ancient and respectable cult places exempted from persecution (Liv. 39.18.7).\(^{29}\) It is true that this reasoning strips the archaeological evidence of the possibility to test the thesis of Roman intervention outside Roman territory, but I doubt whether this evidence can be used as ‘a strong argument’ to the contrary, i.e. that the legislative reach of the edict included only *ager Romanus*.\(^{30}\) For example, this Dionysiac cult place could have been closed temporarily, invisible in the archaeological record, or did not have an orgiastic character,\(^ {31}\) the main point of Roman concern. But we also ignore the relation between the intentions of the Roman authorities and their practical effectiveness.\(^ {32}\) In order to employ archaeological data meaningfully in this discussion a larger sample size than one or two is needed.

In any case, as far as regards the reach of the *senatusconsultum de Bacchanalibus*, Pailler does not accept the notion that allies are included. And more recently, both Mouritsen and De Cazanove, independent from each other, came – though by different interpretations – to the conclusion that the *senatusconsultum* was limited to Roman territory. This might seem legitimate in light of the location, but the interpretation of *foideratei* remains problematic. Perhaps, it could be suggested that *foideratei* indeed refers to the most obvious meaning of the word, i.e. citizens of *civitates foederatae*; *socii*, but that the inscription of Tiriolo was directed at Roman / Latin citizens. This ‘inconsistency’ could perhaps be explained if we understood better the particular process by which the inscription was constituted.\(^ {33}\)

\(^{27}\) De Cazanove 2000a.

\(^{28}\) Jolivet and Marchand 2003.


\(^{30}\) Thus Mouritsen 1998, 56.


\(^{32}\) Cf. the surprise of the Roman authorities at the discovery by Sp. Postumius, whilst engaged in his enquiries, that the Roman colonies of Sipontum and Buxentum, founded only 9 years before, were left by its inhabitants (Liv. 39.23.3-4).

\(^{33}\) Andreas Bendlin, during the conference held at Dresden in November 2007, argues that in theory Rome could interfere in religious affairs in allied territory, but that the *senatusconsultum* under study referred to “Angehörige der eigenen sozialen Schicht”. Discussion on the formation and composition of the inscription, by Roman or local authorities, or both: e.g. Bernard 1908; Fraenkel 1932; Keil 1934; Krause 1936; MacDonald 1944, esp. 28-31; on the importance of the public declamation of the text cf. Martina 1998.
A preliminary conclusion could be that in the case of the Bacchanalia Rome indeed aspired to intervene in religious affairs outside its territory. Because of the exceptional character (and still somewhat dubious evidence) I would hesitate however to consider the Bacchanalian affair as proof for the existence of a Roman policy of religious intervention. Another argument to separate the extraordinary Bacchanalian affair from the discussion on religious romanisation is that the repression was apparently prompted by concerns on a socio-political level, not by the cult itself. The measures described in the senatusconsultum regard especially the organisation of the cult, which must be placed under Roman control.34

COLONIES AND CULTS

Perhaps the Bacchanalian affair can be, at most, described as a negative form of Roman influence in the religious sphere: repression and control, not the active spread of Roman forms of religion seems to have been the objective.35 An active spread of Roman religious ideas has been recognised relatively unequivocally, however, in relation to Roman colonisation. Not only are these newly installed communities thought to have performed rituals according to Roman customs themselves, but they are also conceptualised as strategical centres for the consequent spread of Roman culture and religion in Italy outside the colonial settlements. Indeed, colonies have been described as the “greatest tool of social and military control, and afterwards of Romanization”,36 and even as “religious staging posts of Roman expansion”.37 The foundation ritual of colonies is thought to have been ‘Roman’, including the ploughing of the sulcus primigenius, thereby marking the pomerium, and the offering of the first fruits of the earth in a ritual pit.38 Also, Roman foundation myths were used to consolidate the Roman efforts, as in the case of the Latin colony of Luceria in Daunia, where apparently an Athena Ilias cult recalled the Trojan myth.39 Together with the installation of the new oppidum a political and ideological set of elements was implanted, which more or less copied the urban organisation of the mother city in synthetic form. Colonies were actually ‘small Romes’, as Aulus Gellius put it still in AD 169.40 Amongst these elements are the auguraculum, the forum, and, perhaps most important of all, the typical Capitolium-temple. These temples with three cellae are

---

34 But cf. NORTH 1979, 91, on the inseparability of religious and political issues: “It is obviously a relevant and important fact that the Senate should be so interested in controlling the external form and property of the Bacchic group. But it would be quite wrong to argue that this interest in organization shows that they were indifferent about the religious issue”; cf. also NIPPEL 1997 for the social / psychological motives; 72: “Eine Erklärung für das massive Zuschlagen dürfte in einem tief in der römischen politischen Kultur verwurzelten Verschwörungssyndrom liegen,” and LINKE 2000, esp. 272-273.

35 On the important mechanism of control as a factor of change, cf. infra.

36 TORELLI 1999, 3. Cf. SALMON 1969, 54: “the Latin colonies … were the real instrument in the romanization of Italy.”

37 DE CAZANOVE 2000c, 75.

38 Cf. e.g. the vivid accounts in BROWN 1980, 16-17 and SALMON 1969, 24; see now GARGOLA 1995.


40 Gell. 16.13.9. Cf. SALMON 1969, 18: “… although Gellius was referring to colonies of his own day (AD 169), his description is valid to a great extent also for those of the Republic.”
thought to have expressed pro urbanty and Romanness, to the effect that others in the area came to admire and eventually imitate the model. The Etrusco-Italic temple model would thus have spread as a superior symbol of Romanness and urbanity.\footnote{Torelli 1999, 127.} A similar case has been made for the terracotta decoration of the temples and the ideological program of the depicted figures and scenes.\footnote{E.g. Strazzulla 1981; Torelli 1993a; cf. Guidobaldi 1995 for the ager Praetutianus.} Architecture and decoration forged a firm relation with the metropolis.

Similarly, the ties between the colonies were strengthened by rituals, some of which were performed in the same way as at the shrine of Diana on the Aventine: in various colonies reference is made to this sacred law set up in Rome for the regulation of the colonial cults.\footnote{At Salona (AD 137), Narbo (AD 11) and Ariminum (first century AD). Cf. Beard, North and Price 1998, 330. Cf. e.g. the map in Torelli 1999, 123 fig. 54, with the legend: “Map of distribution of architectural terracottas of Etrusco-Italic type: hachured the original area; in grey the second-century BC diffusion as a consequence of imitation (Umbrian area) or of the influence of Roman colonization (Picene and Samnite areas)”.
} Also the dedication of black gloss cups to the gods, so-called pocola deorum, has been interpreted as a typically colonial ritual, which would establish a link between the colonies themselves on the one hand and with Rome on the other. Not only the black gloss cups themselves are regarded as ‘Roman / Latin’ or ‘romanised’,\footnote{Morel and Coarelli 1973. Cf. Franchi De Bellis 1995, 370 who states, on the relation between colonists and material culture (after citing Gellius) that especially the evidence of ceramics “delinea, nei primi anni della colonia … una continuità di gusti e stili tipicamente ‘romani’”, also with regard to the preferred forms. She links these preferences to the Latial origin of the colonists. Nonnis in Cifarelli, Ambrosini and Nonnis 2002-2003 sees the spread of the pocola also as indicative of romanisation, just as the so-called ‘Heraklesschalen’.
} but also their use, and especially the gods that are inscribed on them would relate to specifically Roman or Latin religious ideas (cf. Chapter 7).\footnote{Cf. Ortalli 2000, 503 and Franchi De Bellis 1995, 371. In Chapter 7 the so-called pocola of Ariminum are discussed in more detail.
} Other types of black gloss ceramics have similarly been related to Roman influence in colonial contexts.\footnote{Esp. in relation with Hercules: Morel 1988; cf. Bisham 2006, 108.
}

Another typical colonial practice would have formed the dedication of anatomical ex-votos of the so-called Etrusco-Latial-Campanian group of votive materials. The appearance of this specific type of terracotta dedications in the form of human body parts, probably offered in thanks or as requests for a cure, fertility or general wellbeing, has been linked geographically to Roman colonisation.\footnote{Briefly in Torelli 1973; cf. also Fenelli 1975; full documentation in Comella 1981, esp. p. 775 on the relation with colonisation; Torelli 1999, 121-122; De Cazano 2000c. Cf. also, polemically, Sisani 2002.
} The phenomenon would have been introduced from Greece\footnote{Sometimes connected, incorrectly, with the introduction of Aesculapius in Rome in 293 BC: e.g. Comella 1982-1983; De Cazano 2000c with the critique by Schultz in her review of De Cazano 2000c in BMCR (2002.06.30) and Glinister 2006, 21-23.
} to Latium, and from there the practice would have followed the stages of the Roman conquest of Italy closely, in particular the areas occupied by Latin colonies. They would have been “véritables indicateurs de...
la conquête”. Thus the appearance of votives of this type in the southern Latin colonies of Luceria (314 BC) and Paestum (273 BC) has been interpreted as indicative of the link between colonisation and the spread of the model. Often a very direct connection between the ethnic or legal status of people and material culture is made: Torelli argues for example that regional differences in the content of deposits reflect differences in the make-up of the population, full Roman citizens being responsible for ‘standard’ votive deposits, and cives sine suffragio for anomalies. Similarly, ex-votos of this type are seen as direct indicators of the presence of Roman colonists outside the area of origin. In any case, the anatomical votives are charged with ideological weight; according to Torelli: “Latin colonisation was responsible for propagating, well beyond the original borders of central Etruria, Latium, and Campania, the use of anatomic ex-votos, with all the possible implications of such use – a striking sign of Roman superiority both in the ideological and material sphere.”

It is important to point out that, in the common opinion, the material reflections of these typical Roman colonial religious models are not restricted to the colonies and the colonists themselves. Rather, these symbols of urbanitas and Romaness irradiated from the colonies and affected the surrounding areas. The colonies were in every respect propugnacula imperii in Cicero’s words (Leg. agr. 2.73), strongholds of Roman control, and spreading Roman religion outside Rome. Temple architecture, terracotta decoration, and anatomical ex-votos have been assigned key roles as ideological-religious aspects of Roman colonisation. But at the same time these ideological-religious aspects are seen as the agents and markers of ‘religious romanisation’ beyond the colonies: they would have functioned rather as catalysts, and their beneficiary influence would have spread into the ‘indigenous’ Italic areas. Thus, especially the Capitolium model would have expressed urbanity and Roman ideals, an abstraction of imperial power and sophistication, and its prestige was the reason to

---

50 The diversity would reflect “the difference in treatment of the areas after the Roman conquest and the consequences of different types of population mix. Trebula and Corvaro [where votive deposits of the Latin type were found], with their more distinctly Roman cultural and religious characteristics, suggest that their territories were included in the agrí quaestoríi and were therefore lands primarily, if not exclusively inhabited by Roman citizens, while the votive deposits of Nursia and Plestia, with their mixed character, perfectly reflect the situation of the praefecturae … where, for time at least, cives optímo iure cohabited with cives sine suffragio”. (TORELLI 1999, 122).
51 TORELLI 1983, 241 on “le tangibili prove di questa presenza coloniale rispetto alle aree circostanti appartenenti a socii” and “l’impatto ‘romanizzatore’” in relation to, amongst other things, the votive deposits of Trebula Mutuesca and Carsoli. Cf. also COARELLI 2000, 200, on the votives in Pisaurum: “questo tipo di ex-voto é caratteristica esclusiva della cultura laziale: esso costituisce in effetti uno dei più sicuri fossili-guida per identificare la presenza, al di fuori dell’area di origine, di coloni provenienti da Roma o dal Lazio. La presenza di tali oggetti nel lucus pesarese attestata, senza possibilità di dubbio, la frequentazione di esso da parte di coloni virilani …”
52 TORELLI 1999, 41-42.
adopt the model for theItalic neighbours. Indeed, according to Torelli, “the superiority of the [scil. urban] model ... rendered easy and consequential the exportation of the cultural forms ingrained in that model. Amongst these cultural forms Etrusco-Italic temple building ... took first place”.\(^{54}\) This reasoning posits therefore a development from centre to periphery, with colonies as intermediary points. In this way, architectural or artistic developments in the ‘remote’ Italic areas can all be linked ultimately to Rome. For example, the Samnite three \textit{cellae} temple at Pietrabondante is thought to have been inspired by Roman models (cf. Chapter 3). While describing the general influence of Hellenistic culture through the mediation by Rome, Salmon states: “The inspiration clearly came from Rome. The many new temples, for instance, owed much to her example,” and further on, on Pentrian Samnium: “The temples were not necessarily built to Roman measurements, but in style, lay-out and decoration they owed much to Rome.”\(^{55}\)

However, this conception of the romanising role of colonies draws heavily on both a rather unilinear conception of cultural communication (cf. Chapter 1) and a narrow and specific conception of Roman colonisation, which in the last years has been attacked seriously. As to the latter, in recent studies the uniform and stable, and indeed ‘Roman’ character of colonies in especially the mid-Republican period has been problematised and to an extent undermined. Especially Michael Crawford, Elizabeth Fentress, and, in most detail, Edward Bispham have shown that much of what we thought to know on mid-Republican colonisation is actually reconstructed on the basis of late Republican and imperial evidence, reflecting to a large measure anachronistic historical and ideological frameworks.\(^{56}\) These scholars have shown how the whole edifice rests to a large extent on the Gellian conception of colonies as ‘small Romes’, whereas contemporary evidence, especially archaeological, to sustain this thesis is lacking. Especially the idea that the founding of colonies was, in the mid-Republican period, the result of a well-planned effort organised by the state authorities which entailed the implantation of a premeditated set of Roman cultural elements, is being problematised. Question marks have been placed as to the ethnicity of the colonists, and especially the influence or persistence of local elements on the formation of the colonies, including their religious dimension.\(^{57}\)

It goes without saying that with the deconstruction of the “Romanness” of Roman colonisation, the argument that precisely these colonies formed the key factors in the romanisation of Italy is weakened seriously. As far as the religious aspects of colonisation are concerned: \textit{Capitolium}-temples are actually less ubiquitous than has often been assumed. Neither were they all installed directly or even soon after the

\(^{54}\) Torelli 1999, 127. Cf. preceding note.
\(^{55}\) Salmon 1982, 100, 117.
\(^{56}\) Crawford 1995; Fentress 2000b, esp. Fentress 2000a; Bispham 2000b; Bispham 2006; cf. also Bradley 2006 on ethnicity and cultural identity, and Mouritzen 2004 on \textit{fora}.
\(^{57}\) Torelli 1999, 3-5, 14-42, 43-88 and \textit{passim}; Bradley 2006; Bispham 2006.
foundation of the colony.\textsuperscript{58} Whereas, for the Republican period, \textit{Capitolia} have been documented for the second and the first centuries BC\textsuperscript{59} the situation is quite different in earlier periods. By far the most \textit{Capitolia} date to the triumviral and imperial period.\textsuperscript{60} Especially Augustan (re-)colonisation seems to have had a crucial role. This has led Bispham to conclude that before the second century BC, the Capitoline model, together with the ‘Gellian simulacrity’ cannot be applied,\textsuperscript{61} and Clifford Ando goes so far as to state that it was indeed especially in late Republican and imperial times that the model is to be expected to have worked, and, by inference, not earlier.\textsuperscript{62} Interestingly, it has been pointed out that the Gellian image of colonies as ‘small Romes’ is unjustified even for the imperial period, also on the religious level. Indeed, as Beard, North and Price contend, the “imitation of the religion of the capital must in practice always have been a creative process, involving adaptation and change”.\textsuperscript{63} By two altars of Augustan date, where elements of Roman monuments are adapted, it is shown how the \textit{colonia} of Carthage was “expressing its own version of Roman identity”, and indeed, that “different \textit{coloniae} were Roman in very different ways”.\textsuperscript{64} Likewise, the foundation rites of the colonies, with the ritual marking of the \textit{pomerium} are likely to have been important especially in the late Republican and Augustan periods. Ando argues that it is no coincidence that evidence for the use of plows in colonial foundations dates to the times of Caesar (Capua, Urso) and Augustus (Asia Minor).\textsuperscript{65} If, according to him, the practice of ploughing the primordial furrow in these late colonies was “notionally modelled on that at Rome, we should probably regard it as modelled on a self-understanding achieved in light of antiquarian research and no small amount of invention”.\textsuperscript{66} Thus, both the \textit{pomerium} and the proliferation of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Capua, colonised several times, apparently only received a \textit{Capitolium}-temple under Tiberius (Suet. \textit{Tib.} 40).
\item Second century: Luna, 177 BC; possibly Liternum 194 BC. The \textit{Capitolium} identified by Johnson (JOHNSON 1935, 18-41) at Minturnae built “soon after 191 BC” might not have been one: COARELLI 1989, 51-52, since it was located outside the original Roman \textit{oppidum}. First century, especially under Sulla: e.g. the conversion of the temple of Jupiter into a \textit{Capitolium} at Pompeii and perhaps Faesulae (\textit{CIL} XI, 1545) as well. BARTON 1982, 262-266. See BISPHAM 2006, 93 n. 111 with other references, and esp. 99-100 for the weak evidence for the earlier period.
\item Standard works on \textit{Capitolia} in Italy are CAGIANO DE AZEVEDO 1940; BIANCHI 1950; BARTON 1982, 259-266 and are in need of an update (cf. also TODD 1985). For Spain, cf. KEAY 1988, 117-118, 145-146: (late) second century BC.
\item BISPHAM 2006, esp. 93.
\item ANDO 2007, 431-436. Ando questions the importance of \textit{Capitolia} prior to imperial times, arguing that it is “by no means obvious that the tutelary deities of all colonies were – or could be – the same. Not surprisingly, then, \textit{Capitolia} are rather less well attested in early and mid-Republican colonies, but proliferated in the western provinces in the imperial period.”
\item BEARD, NORTH and PRICE 1998, 331.
\item BEARD, NORTH and PRICE 1998, 333, 334.
\item Capua: Dessau, \textit{ILS} 6308; Urso: \textit{lex Ursonensis} c. 73; Asia Minor: LEVICK 1967, 35-37.
\item ANDO 2007, 433.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Capitilia are to be understood within the creation of a particular ideology situated in the late Republican and Augustan period. This deconstruction of the traditional model of continuity in ideology and physical layout of colonies is extremely important. It might not be necessary to relegate these ‘colonial’ religious and ideological elements solely to late Republican and early imperial invention: the fact that most of the evidence comes from later periods is in itself no proof that similar ideologies did not exist in previous times, and in some cases this is indeed documented. But it is important to re-dimension our views on the ‘Romanness’ of Republican colonies, and not to fill in the blanks uncritically with later evidence.

In conclusion, the importance of the Capitolium type temple as a firm symbol of Romanness for the early and mid-Republican periods is hard to document. And with it the notion of a far-reaching ‘romanising’ effect of these on the surrounding areas. But even if the early- and mid-Republican periods remain more difficult to gauge, at least from the second century BC on there is evidence for the installation of Capitilia. Perhaps they indeed formed symbols of Romanness and urbanitas by then. It should be borne in mind however, that Italy had changed profoundly in the meantime, and that the gap between the Italic “world of non-cities” and Roman cities that is often conceptualised was in most areas less impressive by then. If the temples could well represent civic or urban pride and express a certain identity for the own urban community, their ‘irradiating’ effect on the hinterland was perhaps rather limited.

Also the idea that the spread of Roman religious ideas and superiority were documented by way of the distribution of anatomical votives has been criticised seriously. Maria Donatella Gentili and Fay Glinister have recently pointed out several weaknesses in the idea that anatomical votives closely reflect Roman influence. In the first place, the conception that the distribution pattern of this type coincides neatly with Latin colonisation has been partly formed by a research bias in favour of exactly Latin / Roman areas. The correlation has therefore to be nuanced, since several other less ‘Roman’ areas yielded this type of votives too. Also, certain areas of Latin colonisation did not yield anatomicals. Another problem regards the dating of the votives, which is difficult. In any case, Etruscan votives of the type predate Roman colonisation in that area. Moreover, although Greek influence is clear, this cannot be

67 BISHPHAM 2006, esp. 74-75; ANDO 2007, 434, on religious institutions in colonies: “As with the pomerium, so with Capitilia, it may be that practice homogenized around a particular ideal in response to cultural changes at work in Rome in the late Republic and early Principate.”
68 GLINISTER 2006; GENTILI 2005, esp. 372-373.
69 Esp. from the Apennines and the Adriatic coast: GENTILI 2005, 372 and GLINISTER 2006, 18-19, with references. One could add, e.g. Schiavi d’Abruzzo (CAMPANELLI and FAUSTOFERRI 1997) and the sanctuary at Casalbore, for which BONIFACIO 2000, 34 argues that the appearance of anatomicals found here “riconde in discorso degli influssi diversi subiti in questa zona per la presenza di mercenari e la notata posizione dell’area sacra in rapporto con un’importante direttrice di traffico”. GUIDOBALDI 2005, 397 explains the presence of the type in the ‘ethnic’ sanctuary of the Marrucini by the romanising influence of colonists.
70 GENTILI 2005, 372.
equated with Roman influence (especially since the phenomenon predates the official introduction of Aesculapius in Rome, with which it erroneously has been connected)\(^{71}\) and local traditions may have played an important role in the development of the type.\(^{72}\) Thus, both in temporal and in geographical terms, the practice to dedicate anatomical terracottas seems to have been a much wider phenomenon.

More fundamentally, Glinister criticises the conceptualisation of the mechanism responsible for the spread of anatomical votives in the traditional ‘colonialist’ vein: she argues that it is hard to see a deliberate Roman strategy in this regard, and points out that their appearance can be better understood as the result of various, local processes by which people chose to adopt these elements, part of the Hellenistic cultural *koiné*.\(^{73}\) Therefore, anatomical terracottas appear in Roman and Latin communities, but “this would represent neither a conscious Roman policy, nor the spread of a distinctively Roman religious form”.\(^{74}\)

In other words, even if perhaps the relation between colonisation and this type of votives cannot be entirely downplayed, it seems at least fair to ask whether anatomical votives constituted “quintessentially Roman”\(^{75}\) rituals, or were perceived as such. Glinister’s deconstruction effectively emasculates the ideological, ‘romanising’ aspect of anatomical terracottas, and with it their possible role in the ‘religious romanisation’ of Italy.

The argument is of course basically identical to the discussion on the role of the three *cellae* temple or ‘*Capitolium*’. It all comes down to the inherent impossibility to read fixed meanings in certain expressions of material culture. These material expressions only gain their possible ‘Roman’, ‘urban’ or ‘superior’ quality within an ideological framework or discourse constructed for that purpose. Whereas a case can surely be made for the interplay with such a discourse in the context of *Capitolia* (but especially in later periods, and much less for three *cellae* temples in general), a similar framework does not seem to exist in the case of the anatomical votives – or at least not in antiquity. In sum, the image of colonies as key elements in the religious romanisation of Italy in the Republican period needs to be more nuanced, especially regarding the ‘irradiation’ of Roman religious culture outside the colony. This is not to say that religion and ritual were not important in the colonies; on the contrary, it does seem justified to believe that they were fundamental to the constitution of the new community. Indeed, amongst the scanty archaeological evidence for the earliest phases of colonies, cult sites take first place – especially when compared to domestic architecture, for instance.\(^{76}\) But if these rituals were in any way (conceived to be) Roman, or even meant to be spread beyond Roman territory, is an entirely different matter.

\(^{71}\) Cf. *supra* n. 48.
\(^{72}\) TURFA 2004.
\(^{73}\) GLINISTER 2006, 23-27.
\(^{74}\) GLINISTER 2006, 25, cf. 32.
\(^{75}\) TORELLI 1999, 96.
\(^{76}\) PELGROM 2008.
Apart from the Bacchanalia and the colonial cults, arguably the conduct towards Italic cult places should be included when studying Roman influence in the religious realm.

**The Fate of Italic Sanctuaries. Destruction, Desolation and Colonisation**

**DID ROME CLOSE SANCTUARIES?**

The general attitude of Rome towards religious affairs outside its territory is thought to have been one of tolerance, or simply lack of interest. Perhaps apart from the exception of the Bacchanalia, Rome would have let her neighbours in peace. Just like Tacitus’ description on the romanising strategy applied in Britain by Agricola (21), no restrictive policies, but rather encouragement through prestige would have been the major stance: indeed, in this vision, Rome may have tried to lure Italic people with Capitoliia and anatomical votives. However, although this aspect is often left out in discussions on Roman religious control, there is an important exception to this rule, which is, interesting enough, itself to a large measure a modern construction: the idea that Rome closed down or ‘abolished’ sanctuaries.

Sanctuaries have, as will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3, been seen as important political foci of the Italic peoples, especially in the non-urbanised areas. As a logical consequence of this political function, it is often assumed that sanctuaries were destroyed or closed after the incorporation in the Roman state. For Emilio Gabba, for example, it is natural that federal sanctuaries were closed down precisely for this reason, and he argues that Pietrabbondante was “semplicemente chiuso per ragioni politici”, just as perhaps the Etruscan fanum Voltumnae in the third century BC. The idea is present in many studies, especially with regard to Samnite sanctuaries. Recently, for example, Scheid has argued that the sanctuary of Pietrabbondante would have undergone a proper damnatio memoriae. Adriano La Regina, on the same sanctuary, speaks of a “profanatio dei sacra publica”, and assumes as well that the cult at the sanctuary of Campochiaro was suppressed and transferred to the municipium of Bovianum.
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77 Cf. on religious toleration e.g. FRATEANTONIO 2003, 9-16 with references.
78 E.g. by DE CAZANOVE 2000c and GLINISTER 2006.
80 GABBA 1972, 97; TORELLI 1968, 74.
81 Cf. e.g. DYSON 2003, 79-80: “Since the sanctuaries were the focus of elite resistance to Rome, they were attacked by the Romans, especially during the Social War in the early first century BC. Most were destroyed, but a few did remain in use under the Empire,” without giving any references; and recently ZACCARDI 2007. Cf. also the interesting reversal of this idea: the fact that sanctuaries had an important function would be proved by the consequent abandonment after the loss of independence: DENCH 1995, 139; LOMAS 1996, 171.
82 SCHEID 2006b, 78: “Son abandon traduit la damnatio memoriae définitive du lieu de culte qui servit un temps de centre politique aux insurgés, ainsi que les inscriptions l’attestent. Mais il s’agit là d’un cas extrême.”
83 COARELLI and LA REGINA 1984, 204. Cf. also LA REGINA 1976, 237 on “la cancellazione giuridica e la soppressione delle attività ufficiali”. More carefully on Pietrabbondante e.g. CAPINI 1991b, 114.
Although it is true that the booming times of architectural refinement and construction seem to come to an end after the Social War, it is important to emphasise that there is not a shred of evidence for this well-established idea of closure or destruction. Archaeologically, at least, it seems hard to find evidence for the official shutting down or destruction of sanctuaries: in fact, on virtually all of the Samnite cult sites activity is registered also for the post-Social War period. Not only in the most important ‘political’ sanctuary of Pietrabbondante, but also at Schiavi d’Abruzzo, and in the case of S. Giovanni in Galdo, as will be shown in more detail in Chapter 5, where the finds from the excavation are discussed. It could be objected that these archaeological remains could represent ‘private’ actions, whereas the ‘public’ aspect of the cult was abolished. A total closing or destruction can be excluded however, and since there is no positive evidence that sanctuaries underwent this kind of official restrictive measures, judgment is perhaps best suspended.

There is, of course, no doubt that sanctuaries were often the target of plunder and destruction, especially in war situations: numerous instances are listed in the literary sources. A famous example is the Proserpina sanctuary in Locri which was plundered in 205 BC by Roman soldiers after the city had defected to Hannibal (Liv. 29.8.1). In peace time, the temple of Hera Lacinia near Croton was stripped from its marble tiles by the censor Q. Fulvius Flaccus in 173 BC (Liv. 42.3), and, in a provincial context, the greed of C. Verres between 73 and 70 BC is telling. But plunder, for economic reasons, or conscious destruction, for ideological ones in the heat of the fighting (cf. infra) is something else than an official restrictive policy banning the use of these sanctuaries once the war, always won by Rome, was over. Moreover, although the above mentioned cases may represent the tip of an iceberg, it is as well to emphasise that in all of them action was undertaken to protect the affected parties. Before turning back to the position of Italic sanctuaries after the Roman conquest, it is of some interest to consider – very briefly – conceptions of the role of sanctuaries and cult in warfare.

SANCTUARY, CULT AND COMMUNITY IN WARFARE

The sanctuary of Diana Tifatina, on the Mons Tifata some three and a half miles north of Capua, was of central importance for the Capuan community. It may already have occupied a central place in the organisation of the settlement in the ninth century BC. In myth and poetry, the sanctuary is closely connected to the heroic founder of Capua, Capys. Although the genealogical position of this figure remains unclear (he is, in the
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85 Cf. Chapters 7, 8 and esp. 9 on the problem of archaeological ‘continuity’ at sanctuaries, which may hide re-use under rather different conditions.
86 Interesting is the example of the rich sanctuary of the lucus Feroniae, plundered by Hannibal; apparently the soldiers would have scrupled to take everything out of religio (Liv. 26.11.8-10).
88 Frederiksen 1984, 118.
sources, variously great-grandfather of Rhomos, a relative of Aeneas, one of the Alban kings, or a Samnite hero), the myth may have existed as early as the fourth century BC. The story goes that Capys, from the moment that he drew the *sulcus primigenius* of the city, had a white deer that was dedicated to Diana. The deer had, from the existence of the city on, even become the *numen loci*, and lived for thousand years (Sil. *Pun.* 13.115-137). Q. Fulvius Flaccus sacrificed the holy deer before taking Capua, which had defected from Rome in 211 BC. As has been referred to in the Introduction, the Roman general thus symbolically destroyed the Capuan community. Also in Rome itself, sanctuaries formed the symbol *par excellence* for the whole community. In a society whose temples were almost by default the result of military successes, it perhaps does not surprise that conversely great fear existed that the community’s gods might fall into the hands of the enemy. During the preparations for the Gallic war in 390 BC, the hierarchy of the Roman values that are to be defended is as follows: *fana deum et coniuges et liberos* (Liv. 5.49.3); first the sanctuaries, then the family. Equally, after the Gauls had left, purifying the temples had priority (Liv. 5.50). Also in the highly rhetorical speech by Sp. Postumius Albinus after the defeat in the Caunine Forks, it appears that the greatest fear was the possibility that *hanc urbem templa delubra fines aquas Samnitium esse* (Liv. 9.9.5), again emphasising sanctuaries by placing them at the beginning, directly after the city itself. It is clear that at least in Livy’s text, which was published in a period of religious restoration by Augustus, sanctuary and community were closely bound together.

Another recurring element in descriptions of war is the deportation of cult statues to Rome; again symbolically taking the conquered community into captivity. Often reference is made to the so-called ritual of *evocatio*; the summoning of the gods of the hostile city to leave the city and come to Rome. However, the historical cases of *evocatio* are few, and suspiciously they are especially mentioned in relation to the most imminent and critical moments in Roman history, such as the conflicts during the early Roman expansion in Italy, notably Veii, and Carthage. Indeed, the capture of Veii in 396 BC with the *evocatio* of Juno Regina has been recognised generally as the prime example. Other cases have been recognised in Volsinii (264), where Vertumnus would have been ‘evoked’ (and a relation with the *fanum Voltumnae* has
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89 Frederiksen 1984, 118 n. 11 for sources. Frederiksen mentions fourth-century BC coins documenting Capys, but the editor of Frederiksen’s book, Nicholas Purcell, could not trace them; cf. Heurgon 1942, 325.

90 Cf. Heurgon 1942, 321-324 and De Franciscis 1956, 45-46 for the sources and the connection to the sanctuary.


92 in conspectu habentes fana deum et coniuges et liberos et solum patriae deforme belli malis et omnia quae defendi repetique et ulisci fas sit: “They must keep before their eyes the temples of the gods, their wives and children, and their country’s soil, disfigured by the ravages of war-everything, in a word, which it was their duty to defend, to recover or to avenge.”

93 For these examples, Stek 2004, 32-33.

94 For religion in Livy cf. Levene 1993, on the relation with Augustan ideology esp. 245-248.

95 E.g. the statue of Jupiter Imperator from Praeneste in 380 BC: Liv. 6.29.8.

96 Liv. 5.21-22. On *evocatio* see esp.: Basanoff 1945; Le Gall 1976; Blomart 1997; Gustafsson 2000; Ferri 2006.
been suggested here; cf. *infra*), in Falerii (Minerva Capta and Juno Curitis), and in Carthage (in 146 BC, Juno Caelestis). But all these cases are quite dubious, reconstructed as they are on rather late and seldom explicit historical evidence (esp. Livy, Servius and Macrobius). An inscription found at Isaura Vetus in Turkey, dating to 75 BC, has been interpreted as evidence for an *evocatio* as well, but this cannot be inferred from the actual text.

In a critical study, Gabriella Gustafsson has shown that the idea of the existence of a fixed practice or rite of *evocatio* is highly problematic, and that later mythography and historiography, and especially the intertwining of these, have (in)formed our scarce sources to such a degree that the concept of *evocatio* is hard to use for historical analysis. Indeed, it might be that accounts on the ritual of the *evocatio* are highly interesting in the context of the ideological and theological frameworks in the time that these accounts were made, but are to be used with great caution in the discussion on the religious romanisation of Italy in the Republican period.

But even if they might be in some cases historical, it should not be excluded that stories of *evocationes* were especially or even exclusively important for (a certain group of leading) citizens of Rome, and did not affect the communities that were ‘deprived’ of their gods. In any case, it remains doubtful whether the conquered communities believed that their gods had left (of their own will!) to Rome as well. In this context, it is interesting to ask what happened to the cult places after they had been robbed of their gods. Answering this simple, and perhaps somewhat naïve, question is of course difficult in light of the nature of the evidence; but it is important to remember it, also with regard to the possible intentions from Roman side.

The *evocatio* of Juno Regina from Veii is often accepted as more or less historical. The discussion on the location of the temple of Juno Regina has perhaps not yet been satisfactorily concluded and still awaits firm evidence. But at the present state, it seems that Torelli’s thesis that the temple is to be identified on the edge of the Piano di Comunità, and not, as previously thought, in the Piazza d’Armi temple, has most credits. It follows that the ‘break’ in the cult that has been recognised in the Piazza d’Armi temple has nothing to do with the *evocatio* of Juno Regina. And the cult
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99 GUSTAFSSON 2000. Cf. the attempt by BLOMART 1997 to opt for a wider definition of *evocatio* – including e.g. the introductions of Magna Mater (204 BC) and Aesculapius (292 BC), which however only leads to the devaluation of the term.
100 Cf. e.g. FEENEY 1998.
101 E.g. RÜPKE 1990, 162-163; BEARD, NORTH and PRICE 1998, 34-35 and even the very critical GUSTAFSSON 2000, 52 admits that “it is reasonable to assume that there is at least a core of historical truth in it”.
102 TORELLI 1982, arguing that Piazza d’Armi cannot be the *arx*, whereas Livy 6.21.10 explicitly states that the *aedes Junonis* was located in *Veientana arce*. Followed also by COLONNA 2004. (Somewhat curiously, GUSTAFSSON 2000, 46-47 seems to suggest that the Portonaccio temple is a candidate as well).
place on the Piano di Comunità presents a rather different image: here the materials, varying from bucchero and fine wares, black gloss to Roman wares, appear to attest to continuity from the fifth century BC to the Roman imperial period. Nearby, a deposit with votives dating from the fourth to second centuries BC has been revealed. Thus, the cult seems to have continued after the alleged transfer of the cult statue in 396 BC.

One could argue therefore, in this case of *evocatio*, for the existence of ‘discrepant experiences’ in Roman and local traditions. No mention is made of the duplication or continuation on the place of origin of cults in *evocatio* contexts, but it might be suggested that this is not accidental: for the Roman audience for which the *evocatio* was ‘evoked’, it was of no importance whether the cult continued in the place of origin or not.

Although a thorough analysis of the passages on the destruction of sanctuaries during warfare should be carried out, an exercise which clearly reaches beyond the aims set here, one gets the impression that the above posited condition of the *evocatio* accounts could apply as well to the more general descriptions of sanctuaries that are being destroyed. Of course, this is not to say that Roman soldiers did not sack sanctuaries, but it seems probable that the rhetorical and ideological frameworks of the contexts in which the Roman historians worked highly influenced these accounts, and also that the factual destruction of a sanctuary could have been given a specific and differing meaning according to the different groups involved.

**THE DECLINE OF RURAL SANCTUARIES AFTER THE SOCIAL WAR**

Apart from the idea that Rome violently or legally suppressed Italic sanctuaries that was treated above, there is general consensus that rural sanctuaries declined after the Social War. This is most often seen as a result of the urbanisation that was a feature of the Roman municipalisation. Attention was focused on the new urban centres, and it is there that most monumental buildings arise. The survival of the Italic cult places would have depended on the extent of their integration in the new municipal structures. In this sense, Kathryn Lomas, voicing a widely held view, argues that the
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104 TORELLI 1982, 125. There might have been as well an Augustan reconstruction phase: 128. Excavations have been prompted by Torelli’s hypothesis: cf. COLONNA 2004. Interesting to note, in Livy 5.22, before the transfer, the statue of Juno is asked to come to Rome again after the *evocatio* proper (although it should be remembered that the word *evocatio* does not appear once in the whole passage).

105 Torelli extrapolates this situation, interpreting it as a typical feature of *evocationes*. He argues that the rite “consisteva in effetti nella sola traslazione del *signum*” and adduces Falerii and *Lucus Feroniae* as further examples of *evocationes* where cult continued (TORELLI 1982, 128). In these last two cases no *evocatio* is documented however. (On Falerii see GUSTAFSSON 2000, 56-59. For Feronia’s alleged *evocatio* no sources exist, but it has been proposed to connect her cult in Rome with M. ’Curius Dentatus’ campaign in 290 BC in the Sabine area, or the capture of the *lucus Feroniae* near Capena in 395 BC. Cf. TORELLI 1982, 128 n. 53; COARELLI 1980, 284; COARELLI 1981b, 40-42; COARELLI 1997, 198).

106 Cf. e.g. FRATEANTONIO 2003, 88-95. With regard to the relation between sanctuaries and warfare in esp. the Greek / Hellenistic world cf. the contributions in SORDI 1984.

107 CURTI, DENCH and PATTERSON 1996, 179. Cf. e.g. also LOMAS 1996, 171.
Ch. 2. ‘Religious Romanisation’

The decline of rural sanctuaries after the Social War “was symbolic of increasing Romanization” and that “emphasis shifted towards temples and shrines in the growing (and Romanized) cities”.

Similarly, Dyson states that “In areas like Samnium this [legal restructuring] meant the development of new urban entities designed to replace the old system of pagi, vici and tribal sanctuaries. Some of the great sanctuaries like Pietrabondante were sacked … Others continued in use, but they were subordinated to the local municipia”.

The elaboration of this conception will be treated in greater detail in Chapter 4. It is important here to note that the development of rural sanctuaries is generally seen as antagonistic to Roman influence. Equating romanisation with urbanisation, rural sanctuaries are relegated to traditional Italic patterns of settlement. In the cases that rural sanctuaries flourish, these are explained in terms of ‘survival’ and integration into the Roman structures. An example is the sanctuary of Hercules Curinus in Abruzzo that would have developed from an Italic pagus sanctuary to a municipal one after the installation of a municipium at Sulmo (cf. Chapter 4).

Thus, while it might be harder to distinguish a deliberate policy in this development, Rome might have influenced Italic cults and cult places indirectly. Generally, the idea has been that the survival of sanctuaries was by chance, and depended on where they happened to end up in the new system. But Roman choices and strategies may have played an important role in some instances.

THE INCORPORATION OF SANCTUARIES BY ROME

No official policy of closing or banning of sanctuaries can be discerned in the historical and archaeological record. Neither is it possible to detect a systematic practice of the ‘calling out’ of the gods, or the sacking of sanctuaries during sieges, although it surely happened. Italic sanctuaries dwindled, although some managed to survive.

This could suggest the conclusion that Rome simply did not care much about sanctuaries; another example of the laisser-faire politics commonly ascribed to Rome, as a consequence of toleration or lack of interest. But this might not be wholly true. It seems possible to identify a certain coherence in the treatment of certain Italic sanctuaries, but on a rather less spectacular level than evocationes and sacking. This coherence is to be distinguished in the legal statuses that were assigned to sanctuaries after the Roman conquest. In a recent article, Scheid has drawn attention to this

---

110 Cf. GUARDUCCI 1981, 226. The link with the municipium would be demonstrated by an inscription of a miles e municipio Sulmone and an inscription referring to an auguratus, “probabilmente municipale” (LETTA 1992, 116). As for the sanctuary of Hercules at S. Agata in Campo Macrano, near Castelvecchio Subequo, which would have started as a pagus sanctuary and afterwards incorporated in the centre of the municipium of Superaequum (VAN WONTERGHEM 1984, 78), the epigraphical evidence does not seem to justify such an interpretation (cf. VAN WONTERGHEM 1984, site 1, 5c).
phenomenon of incorporation, which he describes as a “politique conscience et systématique”.111

In the last half of the first century BC and in the early empire, and of course especially under Augustus, a clear strategy of colonisation of cult places can be discerned: a method to bestow the ancient cult places, full of symbolic power, with an autonomous and by consequence Roman status. Examples are the _lucus Feroniae_, transformed into a colony under Augustus,112 but also at Hispellum, Octavian apparently installed the new colony on the place of an ancient Umbrian federal or ‘ethnic’ sanctuary, and a similar case may be made for the ancient sanctuary of Cupra maritima.113 Also the sanctuary of Angitia, in Marsic territory, was made _municipium_, and this may have happened even before the mid first century BC.114 Interestingly, in these examples important Italic cult places are transformed into Roman urban or semi-urban structures.

The appropriation of a once important federal Italic sanctuary in Roman civic structures is also attested at the famous Lucanian sanctuary of Mefitis at Rossano di Vaglio, where the cult continued under the influence of magistrates from the _municipium_ of Potentia.115 Here, in the Roman town, the same Mefitis of Rossano di Vaglio was venerated as well.116

Scheid’s most important observation, however, is that the policy that appears from the above examples was not exclusive for the Augustan period, with its well-known program of religious restoration. Rather, Augustus was building upon and exploiting an earlier tradition in the treatment of symbolically important sanctuaries.117 Early examples of an incorporation policy are the usurpation of the Latin sanctuary at Monte Cavo after the dissolving of the Latin league, or the sanctuary of Juno Sospita at Lanuvium, which was now common to both Romans and Lanuvians, and also at Lavinium rites were celebrated in common.118 Perhaps also the sanctuary of Clitumnus, famous in imperial literature, could have been colonised already in an early stage, together with the installation of the Latin colony of Spoletium in 241 BC.119

The already mentioned sanctuary of Diana Tifatina was to have, in later times, a similar fate. After his victory on Norbanus at Mons Tifata, Sulla gave lands and salubrious sources to this sanctuary, a situation which was reaffirmed under Augustus
and Vespasian. Moreover, the sanctuary held, at least in the imperial period, an independent status, to the like of a municipium or a praefectura. As it appears, Sulla and his successors transformed the cult place into an autonomous district, thereby retracting the sanctuary from other influences and appropriating it for Roman purposes.

In conclusion, it is clear that Rome tried to use or control the symbolic power and esteem of the ancient Italic sanctuaries for her own purposes, and although this policy is most clear in the late Republic and early empire, it can be traced earlier as well. Although Scheid has read the evidence exclusively from an ideological perspective, the rationale behind this policy was perhaps in some cases economical as well: many of the sanctuaries involved were important market places, most famously the lucus Feroniae.

**Conclusion: Urbanity and the Unaffected Countryside**

What conclusions can be drawn on the basis of this brief survey of ideas on the ‘religious romanisation’ of Italy? It seems that the influence of expressions of Roman religion on other Italic peoples is much harder to trace than has often been assumed, or occurred at least in different forms than often assumed.

First, religious romanisation has been interpreted in a positive sense, as the spread of Roman religious ideas in Italy. Urban centres have been seen as the key features in the propagation of these models. Latin and Roman colonies would thus have displayed urbanity and ‘Romanitas’ also by means of cults or religious representations. Especially two elements are often highlighted in this context: the Capitoline cult and associated temples, and votives of the Etrusco-Latial-Campanian type. As to the latter, Gentili and Glinister have shown that the idea that this type of votives would map the level of religious romanisation of different parts of Italy is problematic. They can certainly not simply be used as an ‘indicator’ of Roman or romanised people. Although Capitolia are perhaps less well attested than one would perhaps expect for the mid-Republican period, at least in the late Republican period these can and will indeed have conveyed an urban, ‘Roman’ ideology and pride. The ‘irradiation’ of this model, and its conception as ‘Roman’ outside the colonial territories remains a moot point however.

Second, in a restrictive sense, various ideas exist concerning the extent of Roman interference in the Italic religious realm. The standard example of the senatusconsultum de Bacchanalibus is problematic, because the addressees of the ban remain unclear. Even if it seems perhaps more reasonable to accept that Rome wanted to intervene also outside Roman territory, this must have been an exceptional case. Often a non-intervention or ‘toleration’ policy has been assumed, but this was surely
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121 SCHEID 2006b, 79: “le principe de l’initiative est transparent: il s’agissait de soustraire ce fameux sanctuaire et site à toute influence extérieure, pour le rendre autonome, autrement dit dépendant de Rome seule.”
not standard behaviour. There are many examples of the exertion of influence in the religious sphere. The forms in which this influence was exercised appear however rather different from what has been commonly assumed. Although sanctuaries were surely pillaged, during conflicts but also in peace time, there is no evidence for the systematic suppression or damnatio memoriae of Italic cult places. Although the general idea is that rural Italic cult places declined after the Roman conquest c.q. the Social War, this may not have been the result of official Roman policy. However, Scheid has recently turned the attention to the incorporation of some famous Italic cult places into Roman institutional structures, which proves that Rome at least in some cases did care about Italic cult places well before the Augustan restoration politics.

In conclusion, it appears that the influence of ‘religious romanisation’ was on the whole fairly limited. Moreover, this influence can be recognised almost exclusively in urban contexts. Perhaps religious forms irradiated from there to the countryside, but especially this aspect has been shown hard to prove. Rather, the countryside seems to have remained largely untouched, and developments there are seen as antithetic to the Roman urban forms. Thus, for the Apennine region, Cesare Letta has argued that “nei santuari rurali della regio IV la romanizzazione praticamente non tocca le tradizioni religiose locali, formatesi nei secoli precedenti ... I culti propriamente romani che vengono trapiantati nella regio IV sono introdotti nelle città, non nell’ambiente rurale.” In the few cases that Roman influence can be documented in Italic cult places, this involves a strategy of incorporation in the Roman state, often by ‘autonomisation’, and indeed ‘urbanising’ them.

Apparently, in the sphere of influence of ‘religious romanisation’, there is a dichotomy between urbanity and countryside: was the Italic countryside indeed left behind, and did change occur only in the new urban centres? Rural patterns of settlement, and the sanctuaries and cults within them, are indeed commonly seen as persistent and uninterrupted features of Italic life, untouched or only remotely affected by new developments. Such an idea must be carefully tested in light of the changing roles of Italic sanctuaries before and after the Social War.
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